

abundantly represented on the Australian continent and closely associated with it in ornithological history. This number covers the Lories (*Trichoglossoidæ*), the Lorilets (*Opopsittidæ*), the Palm Cockatoos (*Proboscigeridæ*), and the Black Cockatoos (*Kakatoeidæ* — in part). The discussion of the nomenclature of both genera and species is as usual very full, and there is an historical résumé of the systematic literature of the entire group of Parrots.

Now that Mr. Mathews has reached families that are largely limited to the country of which he writes, or those in the same region, there are but few extra-limital forms discussed and fewer far-reaching changes in nomenclature. We note the following new names in this installment of the work: *Parrupsitta* subgen. nov. (p. 43), type *Psittacus pusillus* White; *Nannopsittacus* gen. nov. (p. 65), type *Cyclopsitta suavisima* Selater; *Probosciger aterrimus oorti* subsp. nov. (p. 94), type locality, Dutch New Guinea. There is an elaborate discussion of the geographic races of the great black Palm Cockatoos and their proper nomenclature, which throws much light on a vexed question.—W. S.

**Origin of the Generic Name *Æthia*.**<sup>1</sup>—Dr. E. Hartert has recently called attention to the fact that the name *Æthia* adopted in the last edition of the A. O. U. Check-List in place of *Simorhynchus*, should be cited from Merrem (*Versuch eines Grundnisses zur Allgemeinen Geschichte und natürlichen Eintheilung der Vögel*, Leipzig, 1788) instead of from Dumont (*Dict. Sci. Nat.*, revised edition, I, 1816, Suppl., 71). This is a very welcome addition to our knowledge of the history of the name, but Dr. Hartert seems rather severe in his criticism of the A. O. U. Committee for not running the name back to its original source.

The writer is responsible for calling attention to the name (see Auk, 1907, p. 190) and so far as he is aware it had not been quoted by any ornithologist except Dumont, which would indicate that Merrem's work referred to by Dr. Hartert as "well known but somewhat scarce," is decidedly less well known than he seems to think. It is moreover not to be found in the libraries of either Philadelphia or Washington. Dr. Hartert asks: "Why was no search made for Merrem's name?" The writer would reply that a search was made. Sherborn's 'Index Animalium' was consulted and while the work cited by Dr. Hartert was found it is stated that it contains no new species and as the name *Æthia* is not listed by Sherborn, it was a natural inference that it did not occur in the work.

Curiously enough Dr. Hartert corroborates Sherborn by stating that the German work contains only vernacular names but adds that *Æthia* occurs on page 7 of a Latin edition which he quotes as 'Tentamen Naturalis Systematis Avium.' This work seems to be less known than the other, although what appears to be the same thing is quoted by Engelmann and

<sup>1</sup> On the Name of the "Auklets." By Ernst Hartert, Ph.D. *Novitates Zoologicae*, XXIII, No. 3, p. 339. December 1, 1916.

some old reviews as 'Primæ lineæ ornithologiæ.' As Dr. Hartert has the advantage of having access to a copy of the work we should be glad to know which is the correct title of the Latin work; also why it is necessary to quote the name from the German edition; and why he quotes the date as 1788 instead of 1787 which is given by both Sherborn and Engelmann as the date of Volume I. It would benefit those interested in 'priority hunting' for which Dr. Hartert states that he has "no time," if he would also tell us what other new names, if any, the work contains thus supplying a valuable addition to Sherborn's list. It might be remarked that from the way in which Dr. Hartert gives the "correct quotation" for *Æthia*, it would appear that the Latin edition was part of the German one but if this were the case we cannot understand how Sherborn missed the name.

With Dr. Hartert's opinion that the adoption of the name from Dumont is quite impossible we cannot agree. The specific name *crisatella* had been applied to but one Auk-like bird, *Alca crisatella* Pallas, and the indication of this species as the type of *Æthia* is, we think, perfectly clear.—W. S.

**Bird Enemies of a few Insect Pests.**—The following statement about the bird enemies of grasshoppers is made in Farmers' Bulletin 747, prepared in the U. S. Bureau of Entomology: "The Bureau of Biological Survey has found that wild birds play a great part in the natural control of grasshoppers. These feathered friends of man are always present where grasshoppers abound and work almost constantly in aiding the farmer. The statement that all birds feed upon grasshoppers is so near the absolute truth that it needs only insignificant modifications. From the largest hawks to the tiny hummingbird there are no exceptions other than the strictly vegetarian doves and pigeons. Although birds of all families prey upon grasshoppers, the following may be selected as the most important destroyers of grasshoppers for their respective groups: Franklin's gull, bobwhite, prairie chicken, red-tailed, red-shouldered, broad-winged, and sparrow hawks, the screech and burrowing owls, yellow-billed cuckoo, road-runner, nighthawk, red-headed woodpecker, kingbird, horned lark, crow, magpie, red-winged and crow blackbirds, meadowlark, lark bunting, grasshopper and lark sparrows, butcher bird, wren, and robin."<sup>1</sup>

It is not possible to present as good an account of the bird enemies of many other pests for birds are particularly fond of grasshoppers. Another injurious insect recently published upon by the Bureau has its bird enemies however, and the statement is made that:

"Among the important enemies of the fall army worm are our common wild birds. Some of these are the following: Crow blackbird or grackle, yellow-headed blackbird, chipping sparrow, bluebird, mockingbird, and meadowlark."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Walton, W. R., Grasshopper Control in relation to Cereal and Forage Crops. Farmers' Bull. 747, October, 1916, pp. 11-12.

<sup>2</sup> Walton, W. R. and Luginbill, P. The fall army worm or "grass worm," and its control. Farmers' Bull. 752, Nov., 1916, p. 12.